

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9, 19, 22, 25, and 27 are canceled.

Support for each amended claim is found at the originally filed claims and throughout the specification.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

The specification objection is obviated by amendment of Table 1.

The indefiniteness rejection of Claims 10-27 is obviated by amendment of Claims 10, 17, and 26.

The anticipation and obviousness rejections of Claims 10-16 and 21-27 as being unpatentable over Ding is respectfully traversed, because Ding does not describe or suggest all of the features of, for example, Claims 1 and 26.

Present Claims 1 and 26 contain the feature of “irradiating with an electron beam, in which the irradiation dose of the electron beam is from 5 to 200 in Mrad.” Applicants note that the purpose of the irradiation is for cross-linking.

In contrast, Ding, at the end of column 5 and the beginning paragraph of column 6, describes that “the polymer blends and products...are exposed to a sterilization dose of radiation.” “Sterilization radiation is typically carried out at much lower doses of radiation than are used to cross-link polymers.” “The typical magnitude...is on the order of about 25 kGys, but can sometimes be as low as 15 kGys.”

Accordingly, the high dose of irradiation in the present invention is not described or suggested by Ding, and in fact, Ding “teaches away from” a cross-linking dose of radiation.

Present Claims 1 and 26, and the claims depending therefrom, cannot, therefore, be obvious or anticipated by Ding. Withdrawal of the anticipation and obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 17-20 as being unpatentable in view of Ding in combination with Doheny, Jr. is respectfully traversed, because the references are not combinable, and because the references, alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest all of the features of present Claim 1.

Applicants note that the radiation dose in Ding, as previously described, is for sterilization and not cross-linking. Doheny, Jr.'s dose is for crosslinking, against the explicit teachings of Ding. Accordingly, the references are not combinable.

Further, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Ding (polymer blend for fabricating medical products) with Doheny, Jr. (heat shrinkable pipe wraps for in ground) because the inventions of Ding and Doheny, Jr., are from different fields and for different purposes.

Finally, even if Ding and Doheny, Jr., are combinable, Applicants note that the radiation of Doheny, Jr., is applied in two stages (see column 11, lines 10-11, of Doheny, Jr.) whereas the radiation in present Claim 1 is applied only once. Accordingly, the combined references do not describe or suggest all of the features of present Claim 1.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants have filed, along with this paper, a terminal disclaimer, to address the double patenting rejection.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/529,206
Reply to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CJ Andres, Jr.', written over a horizontal line.

Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)